## **REMARKS**

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on 24 September 2004 for the above-referenced patent application. The Applicants hereby respectfully request entry of this Amendment and Request for Reconsideration.

In the present Amendment, the Applicants amend claims 1, 10, and 12-13, and cancel claim 5. Thus, the Applicants hereby request reconsideration of all pending claims 1-4 and 6-30.

The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendment of claims 1, 10, and 12-13. Amended claim 1 presents language from cancelled claim 5. Amended claims 10 and 12-13 present language from previously recited claim 11 and is supported on page 7 at line 4, for example.

In the Office Action mailed on 24 September 2004, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 8 and 9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of copending Application No. 10/675,696. In response, the Applicants respectfully submit that all claims 1-10 are now allowable over the copending application of record for at least the following reasons. Newly amended claim 1 reads:

In a magnetic disk drive, a method of bonding lubricant to a surface of a magnetic disk comprising:

providing a heat source at an air bearing surface (ABS) of a magnetic head;

causing the heat source to be energized to produce heat;

causing the magnetic head to be moved across a surface portion of a magnetic disk so that lubricant is thermally bonded to the surface portion from the heat produced by the heat source; and

repeating, on a regular basis, the acts of causing the heat source to be energized and the magnetic head to be moved across the surface portion of the magnetic disk.

Newly amended claim 1 adds the limitation, "repeating, on a regular basis, the acts of causing the heat source to be energized and the magnetic head to be moved across the surface portion of the magnetic disk". This limitation was recited in previous claim 5 which the Examiner objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. Since amended claim 1 now recites allowable subject matter, the Examiner's rejections are overcome and claims 1-10 are now allowable.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claim 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/675,696. In response, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-14 are now allowable for at least the following reasons. Newly amended claim 10 reads:

A magnetic head assembly, comprising:

a magnetic head;

a lubricant bonding heat source comprising one or more pole pieces at an air bearing surface (ABS) of the magnetic head; and

the lubricant bonding heat source being operative to heat a surface portion of a magnetic disk to thermally bond lubricant to the surface portion of the magnetic disk.

Newly amended claim 10 adds the limitation, "comprising one or more pole pieces". A similar limitation is recited in claims 2 and 11 of the originally filed application, which the Examiner objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. Since claim 10 now recites allowable subject, the Examiner's rejections are overcome and claims 10-14 are now allowable.

Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the provisional rejections cited in the first Office Action have now been overcome. Pending claims 1-4 and 6-30 are now allowable over the prior art of record and the application is in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if necessary to expedite prosecution for this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 22 December

JOHN J. OSKOREJ Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER 980 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 214-6303